

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/651,425

Applicant(s)

SONGER ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A. Vu

Art Unit

2193

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan A. Vu.

(3) _____.

(2) Williams, Hughes.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner had introduced some more ideas to enhance the state of the claim to the effect of putting forth what appears to be a crucial and functional part of the elements being descriptively listed; that is, the Applicant's representative was communicated that the term 'support' needs to be elaborated, and the meaning of 'variant' needs to be more commensurate with the Specifications in order to better establish the above functional interaction between elements. These proposed concepts would, if added to the claim, improve the chances for issuance of the case. After reconsideration, the representative has conveyed that Applicant deemed that the state of the claimed subject matter would not need any more addition; and it was concluded that an Office Action would be effected based on the submission of record, no agreement being reached as a consequence of the above..